

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES July 28, 2016

Members Present: Stephen Pritchard, Chairman; William Limbacher, Vice Chairman; Ann Burbine, Clerk, Richard Taylor Robert Vogel and Alternate member Gerard Wynne who arrived at 7:41 pm.

Members Absent: Robert Vogel.

Others Present: Ms. Laura Harbottle, Town Planner.

See Sign-in List for names of others present at this meeting.

Location of meeting: Selectmen's Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chairman Pritchard called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 7/28/16 Planning Board Agenda – Second Amended

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Chairman Pritchard said he wanted to discuss the scenic road for 182-186 First Parish Road first when the item is on the agenda. Mr. Limbacher moved to accept the amended agenda. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor.

50 Country Way – Review of Structural Assessment discussion

Documents

- Structural Assessment from Odeh Engineers dated 7/13 /16 on the Wetherbee House
- Email to Board from Laura Harbottle dated 7/23/16 with 50 Country Way Mixed Use Special Permit decision and owner's estimate for the performance bond

Jim Sandell, Architect from Carr Lynch Sandell and owners Greg Grant and Peter Genta of Greenbush Station LLC were present to review the structural assessment of the Wetherbee House at 50 Country Way. Mr. Sandell said the report by the Board's consultant Odeh Engineers concurs with their report by LeMessurier Engineers on the description of the condition of the house and the implications of moving and restoring it. He indicated the simple conclusion is that the change of use from residential to commercial will result in a non-compliant building. Chairman Pritchard said there was no disagreement on the technical aspects of the report. He asked Colin Simpson from Odeh Engineers what is the overall conclusion on the viability of restoration. Mr. Simpson said they laid out the hurdles on a retrofit process to a new foundation. He indicated the applicant would need to coordinate with the Town to limit the live loads. He said the facts can be used to draw conclusions for an upgrade to business use – with 100 lbs./sf on the first floor and 75 lbs./sf on the second floor, if relief is not obtained due to the historical nature of the building it would be difficult.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that she talked with David Odeh. He said the building has problems typical of its age that can be addressed, but not without cost issues. She said much work is needed; but, the building is not falling apart. All the insect damage would need to be repaired and beams would need replacement. Mr. Limbacher summarized that the building could be saved, but is it worth the effort. Peter Genta indicated it would impact the profit. Mr. Sandell indicated that if the building was rebuilt, it would allow the use of trust joists that will allow the integration of mechanical systems. He said if they had to integrate mechanical systems to the existing building, it would destroy the

building. He said the interior also needs to be stripped due to lead paint. He expressed concern that structurally snow loads are not met and wind and seismic codes also need to be met. He said if the building was rebuilt following the decision by replicating the existing building, the result would be a better building that would perform better, last longer and cost less. Mr. Limbacher asked if they could do all the things outlined in the report. Mr. Sandell said not within the existing floors. He said they would need to add infrastructure that would decimate the interior. He said the columns aren't original and it would be good to replicate the original details. He said the stone from the foundation could be used on-site for a stone wall down to the street. Mr. Limbacher asked what is being proposed in summary. Mr. Simpson said that there is leeway in code requirements due to being a historic structure, but new building elements have to meet code requirements. He said the first floor and foundations would need to be new. He said the second floor would not have the capacity for office use unless the live load was limited. He indicated to move the building lateral bracing would be needed on the inside so all the plaster would not come off the walls and the windows would need to be removed. Mr. Simpson also expressed concern for the roofing with snow valleys which would mean the existing building would need reinforcement for snow loads.

Mr. Sandell said that restricting the second floor live load is not realistic for an office use. Mr. Taylor offered that many building in Boston, including the Bulfinch Building, just saved the historic façade and gutted the whole interior. He said he was hoping the Odeh report would conclude that time and money may not make it feasible to restore the actual building. Mr. Sandell said Odeh did what they were asked to do. He said neither of the two engineering reports will say it is feasible; that is an owner's decision based on the codes and objectives. Mr. Taylor asked how close a new façade would be if replicated. Mr. Sandell said the building is simple – with a gable, new windows, new skin and roof from the outside it would look the same. He said restoration on the inside would be tough. Mr. Taylor asked if it could be restored for residential use. Mr. Sandell said it could and Mr. Grant added if someone wanted to, but the project is a mixed use project.

Chairman Pritchard said restoration was to be the primary public benefit of the project and questioned what the replacement benefit would be if it was not feasible to restore. Mr. Sandell said that the building was always intended upon to be a different use and the mixed use of the project in itself is a benefit and locating the building close to the road puts a historic face to the project. Mr. Wynne questioned if it was financially feasible to save the building. Ms. Burbine said the public benefit is saving the historic building when in reality the public won't be in the building inside. Chairman Pritchard said they seem to be proposing a new structure to look like the old. Mr. Sandell said nothing will be different. Chairman Pritchard was concerned that what is being said now is different than what was said during the permitting phase. It was impressed upon the Board that it was an important public benefit to save the building. Mr. Taylor said the details would matter in the replication. Ms. Burbine asked why the shell couldn't be saved and then do on the inside what they need to do. Mr. Sandell thought that was a good idea. He said materials on the outside can be inspected and replaced as needed.

Ms. Harbottle said that the new elevations show Building A different from the existing structure, with a higher roof and dormers so the proportions are different as now there is a third floor which changes the look. Mr. Sandell said that was the design the Ford Team used so they used it. Chris Ford, the previous owner, said during his inspection 20 years ago it was recommended to tear the building down, but he did not want to do it. He said nothing in the building is historic. Many things have been replaced including the windows and columns. He said the dormers evolved out of the multiple meetings with the Design Review Committee (DRC). He said the two public benefits were saving the house and the path in the MBTA right of way (ROW). He said the barn is being saved

now and the public benefit will live as the new post office. Mr. Ford said they tried to save it, but it needs to be replicated. Chairman Pritchard said that there was no mention in the public hearing that nothing historic remained in the building. He indicated to now say that it is not worth saving and not historic is a problem. Mr. Ford said that elements have been changed and lead paint is an issue.

Chairman Pritchard said his summary on the Odeh report is that it is a difficult building to reuse and probably not worth saving as a whole, but perhaps the façade can be saved and replicated as the public benefit is still an issue. He said he would like to see a proposal for redoing the building including a landscape plan to show reuse of the foundation stone. Mr. Taylor said that if the façade can be replicated with high quality material and details, then that is acceptable to him. Ms. Burbine asked about the dormers - is the Board allowing them as the building does not have them now. Chairman Pritchard said he wants the front to look simple and compare to other properties in the Village Business Overlay District. He suggested no dormers as the building does not have them now. Mr. Taylor said the DRC suggested them. Mr. Pritchard suggested the DRC could review the new elevation with historic preservation in mind. He said he believes that the building does not have to look identical if the historic feeling and ideas are met. Mr. Limbacher maintains that the intent was to preserve the building and now re-engineering of the replication is occurring. Mr. Taylor said they are concluding it is not feasible. Chairman Pritchard asked why the building couldn't be replicated without the added dormers. Mr. Taylor suggested there may be a better solution without exact replication and the owner could explain the benefits. Ms. Harbottle said that the dormers are a little odd here and historically they weren't used in roofs the way they are shown. She said the Board needs to be careful with the details. Mr. Ford said the dormers evolved through the DRC and eliminating them would change the project and the spaces. He said the owners bought a project fully approved. Chairman Pritchard said then the building can be restored.

Hal Stokes of the DRC said dormers were appropriate to the style at the time. Chairman Pritchard said if it is going to be replicated he is happy to have the owners and DRC involved. Mr. Taylor said if they could preserve the building they wouldn't be here and the dormers were in the plans the Board approved. Ms. Harbottle said that nothing was really approved without contingencies. She said the condition calls for if it can't be moved, for a new elevation to be provided that a historical consultant reviews and advises the Board if the replication looks the same. She read condition 25 and indicated it says nothing about the DRC. Mr. Pritchard said then a new elevation is needed and will be reviewed by a historical preservation consultant and a new landscape layout is also needed. He said he would like to do this in an expeditious manner.

**Public Meeting –Site Plan Administrative Review - 6 Old Country Way
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-4-8
Applicant/Owner: Whitecrest Realty, LLC**

Documents

- 6 Old Country Way plan and patio sketch from March 2016 New Site Plan and elevations for 21 – 23 Ford Place dated 7/6/16
- Application for Site Plan Administrative Review received
- Proposed Site Plan 6 Old Country Way Assessor's Parcel 53-4-8 Scituate, MA by Morse Engineering Co., Inc., dated 5/13/15 consisting of sheets 1-6.
- Stormwater Report and Calculations Town of Scituate Stormwater Bylaw for proposed site plan 6 Old Country Way by Morse Engineering Co., Inc.
- Transmittal to departments dated 6/22/16
- Engineering peer review report by Merrill Engineers dated 7/20/16

- Comment from the Board of Health dated 7/22/16
- Email to Board from Laura Harbottle dated 7/26/16 with microbrewery comments on design, water and sewer
- Email to Board from Laura Harbottle dated 7/26/16 with microbrewery comments on stormwater
- Email to Board from Karen Joseph dated 7/27/16 with new microbrewery sketch
- Response to Merrill Engineer's comments by Morse Engineering Co dated 7/28/16
- Merrill Engineer's revised comment letter dated 7/28/16
- Comment from John Clarkeson of Water Resources Committee dated 7/28/16

Charles Fagan of Whitecrest Realty, the applicant, was present along with engineer Greg Morse, Matt Elder, brewer, Attorney Frank Colpoys and design consultant Aaron McCloud. Attorney Colpoys indicated that the project was before the Board for a Site Plan Administrative Review subject to Section 770 of the Zoning Bylaw. He said the section provides an opportunity for small scale business in the Greenbush area. He indicated that Town Meeting approved a zoning change in November 2015 to provide for the use of microbreweries by special permit from the ZBA which was voted favorably on July 21, 2016. He said the applicant has appeared before the DRC and they have received a permit from the Scituate Historical Commission to raze the existing house on the lot; however, the house is proposed to be saved and moved down the street. He said the historic school house from the 1800's will be moved to the site. He said the proposed building is an attractive functional building that meets the criteria of the tenant and landlord.

Mr. Morse indicated that the site at 6 Old Country is a 20,000 sq. ft. lot that is all upland and generally flat. He said there is two way traffic on Old Country Way. Mr. Morse said the historic school house will be renovated to be the tasting room for the microbrewery which will be located to the rear. He indicated that there will be 17 parking spaces on the north side of the building and two in the rear. He said there would be a garage door in the rear for service for box trucks. Mr. Morse said there would be a brick patio for outdoor seating and a brick walkway connecting the entry to Old Country Way. He indicated the facility would be serviced by municipal water and sewer and there will be pretreatment for the effluent. He said the drainage system will be similar to 50 Country Way in that there would be tree box filters for enhanced nitrogen removal as the site is in the Water Resource Protection District. Mr. Morse indicated that they addressed the comments in the Merrill peer review letter and have shown them on the plans.

Chairman Pritchard asked Mr. Elder for an overview of the operation process. Mr. Elder said the process starts with water, barley - grain, hops and yeast. He said there are four gallons of water needed for one gallon of beer. He said hops and grain are delivered in 50 lb. bags and stored inside on pallets. They initially will be delivered every two to four weeks. He said after the initial brewing, yeast will be harvested from the tanks. He indicated spent grain will be trucked out twice a week from the rear service area. Mr. Elder said he is hoping that the organic waste (spent grain) can be donated to a farm for animal feed. He said that the interior will contain vessels for the brewing and processing which are broken down into hot and cold systems. He indicated there will be other deliveries including glassware. Mr. Elder said that 90% of the business is proposed to be out of the tap room as he wants people to come to Scituate. He indicated the tap room has space for about 45 people and feels there is adequate parking. Mr. Elder said that at this point there will be no food prepared, but he said he understands he needs to talk to the Board of Health if that is going to change. Mr. Wynne asked if it is a manned 24 hour operation. Mr. Elder said that people will not be there 24 hours. He said that brewing will occur on Monday and Tuesday and the tap room would be open initially for limited hours on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. He said he does not want the

facility to be a bar. He indicated there would be no processing occurring during the night. Chairman Pritchard asked about the name. Mr. Elder said it is a personal story. He left the corporate world to become a brewer and that is his untold story. He said many people share great stories over a beer.

Ms. Harbottle said there will be a lot of work required to restore the schoolhouse which will be a good tap room/tasting area. She indicated that there are no parking standards for microbreweries and could check other towns. She inquired as to the number of employees to determine how much parking is available for customers. Mr. Elder said there are three owners and will be seven to eight employees. She indicated that the street trees and lights and brick paving were bought with a grant and would like to see them maintained. She indicated that the Water Resource Committee (WRC) was concerned that the water usage may exceed what was told to the town at the town meeting and they would like a condition that if brewing exceeds a certain threshold, there would need to be discussions with the Board again. She said the DPW is concerned about the sewage and pretreatment will be required. She said DPW may need a consultant to look at the sewer and pretreatment issue. She indicated maintenance of the stormwater facilities will be required. Ms. Harbottle was concerned about odors from the organic waste and indicated that the Board may want to make sure it is contained in the event the farmer scenario does not work out.

Peter Palmieri of Merrill Associates, the Board's consulting engineer, said most of his comments from the July 20 plan set were addressed. He said they will require a separate sign permit and that he did not receive the architectural plans. He said that the stormwater system was modelled with an overflow, but the calculations don't reflect the same elevation as the plan. He said the elevations should be the same whether the water reaches the elevation or not. Mr. Morse said that the chambers will never reach the overflow elevation and he can change the calculations to reflect the plan.

Ms. Burbine said that this is a winning scenario for the Town. She said as a member of the Economic Development Commission (EDC), this is what was envisioned for revenue. She said she is not concerned with the prefab metal building. She said if it is tastefully done with the renovated schoolhouse it will be good for Greenbush. She asked about the water usage. Mr. Elder said that one barrel has 31 gallons of beer. He indicated that the first year they hope to brew 850 barrels for a water usage of 132,000 gallons of water. He said 5 gallons of water are needed to make 1 gallon of beer. He said an average family of four uses 146,000 gallons of water per year and a Scituate family uses 138,000 gallons of water per year. He indicated the water use the first year will be less than a family of four. Mr. Elder said that at capacity, the production would be 3600 barrels per year which is about 560,000 gallons per year. Attorney Colpoys indicated the water usage will be less than by right with houses. Mr. Limbacher said he was not concerned with the metal building and clarified that all storage is inside. Mr. Elder affirmed that and indicated the dumpster is located in the rear corner of the site and is enclosed. Chairman Pritchard confirmed there was no process waste in the dumpster and it is just for trash. Mr. Limbacher said the integration of the metal building with the school house is tastefully done and asked if the applicant had received the WRC memo. Mr. Limbacher provided his copy for the applicant.

Chairman Pritchard said that if the production cap needed to be changed, he would want the brewery to come back in. Attorney Colpoys said they would agree to a reasonable production cap. Chairman Pritchard asked them to suggest a number. Mr. Elder said the definition of a microbrewery is taken from the Brewers Association and has limits. Chairman Pritchard said the concern is the limitation of the Scituate water supply. He suggested a limit based on the maximum capacity and if they want to increase capacity they would need to come back. Mr. Taylor liked the proposal and said he was glad that the house and school are both being preserved and restored. He said he liked the front

window in the school and that the schoolhouse mitigates the metal building. He said he would like the light and the brick band in the sidewalk to be continued. Mr. Wynne was pleased with the proposal and welcomes the brewery to town.

Chairman Pritchard said this is a great opportunity for Scituate and asked how much wastewater will be discharging. Mr. Elder said in year one it will be 100,000 gallons with 80% of water use going to the sewer. He said in year four it will be 400,000 gallons. He indicated he has talked with the DPW and is very conscientious of environmental standards. He said he will be pretreating the waste whereas 95% of breweries do not and none in MA do. He said the sewer department treats 1.2 million gpd and the biological oxygen demand and total suspended solids will be higher. He said his load will add 4/1000th of a percent. He said that Mr. Mosca and Mr. Cafferty gave him a green light. Ms. Harbottle said she is waiting for a final email on sewer and water and the Fire Department hasn't commented yet. Mr. Elder said there will be a gas boiler as gas is available. Chairman Pritchard asked about hours and chemical management. Mr. Elder said it will be a day shift type operation and that he will purchase concentrated chemicals and then dilute them. He said he will monitor the pretreatment effluent and dose the chemicals per the sewer range. Chairman Pritchard asked about the storage of hazardous materials and noise from the blowers on the roof. Mr. Elder said the noise may be like a vacuum on the inside and on the outside and the stack from the kettle may smell like a bakery or cooked grain on brew days. He said there would be a chiller on the outside in the back as well as air conditioning condensers. Mr. Elder said they are still working on the sign design.

Chairman Pritchard asked if there was adequate room to back out of the parking spaces. Mr. Morse said the spaces are 18 feet long with a standard aisle. Mr. Taylor asked about the timeframe. Mr. Elder said there is a lengthy permitting process for the brewing license. Attorney Colpoys said that the plans need to be approved before they can go to the federal authorities to complete the permitting. Chairman Pritchard asked where the overflow in the brewery area goes to. Mr. Elder said it goes to floor drains which go to a sump to the pretreatment vessel and then to the sewer. He said the sump is not sized for a catastrophic failure as tank valves can be shut off. He said the pretreatment vessel is 1000 gallons.

Hal Stokes from the DRC was present. He said he applauds the project as it will draw people to town. He said he likes that the schoolhouse and other house will be saved. He asked to see the new sketch as the DRC had some concerns and wanted to meet with the applicant again. Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicant's request that the Public Hearing for Site Plan Administrative Review for the microbrewery proposed at 6 Old Country Way be continued until August 11, 2016 at 9:15 pm in the Selectmen's Hearing Room at Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Hwy and continue the time for filing a decision with the Town Clerk until September 9, 2016.

Public Hearing- Stormwater Permit – 182 – 186 First Parish Road
Public Meeting – Site Plan Administrative Review – 182 – 186 First Parish Road
Resolve possible scenic road violation
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 44-1-20 & 21
Applicant: Peter Zaccardi
Owner: Tar Pouch Realty Trust/ John and Irena Roman

Documents

- Application for Site Plan Administrative Review for a Common Driveway at 182 – 186 First Parish Road for applicant Peter Zaccardi and owner Tar Pouch Realty Trust received 6/27/16.
- Common Driveway Plan Lots 3 & 4 First Parish Road in Scituate by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. dated 7/20/16
- Stormwater Management Plan Lots 2, 3 & 4 First Parish Road in Scituate by Morse Engineering dated June 13, 2016
- Stormwater Permit Application for Administrative Review for Low Impact Projects Town of Scituate Stormwater Bylaw and Regulations Lots 2-4 First Parish Road Assessor's Parcel 44-1-020 & 021 dated 7/13/16
- Stormwater permit transmittal dated 6/28/16
- Transmittal to departments for Common Driveway Site Plan Administrative Review 182 – 186 First Parish Road dated 7/7/16
- Engineering peer review report by Amory Engineers, P.C. dated 7/27/16
- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 7/26/16 with common driveway and stormwater materials
- Response to Amory comments dated 7/28/16 from Morse Engineering with revised Stormwater Management Plan dated July 28, 2016
- Revised letter from Amory Engineers dated 7/28/16

The potential scenic road violation was the first item discussed. Greg Morse from Morse Engineering said that he found out about the alleged violation in June, he indicated he followed up with a letter stating that no trees or stone walls were removed in the town ROW. He said that the record plans show no wall at First Parish Road, but in the back of the property there are walls. Mr. Morse indicated that the lot line is one to two feet in back of the walk. He indicated that the 2014 Decelle Burke plan shows a wall in the property at the front and the property is within one foot of the walk. He said any wall that was disturbed was over two feet from the back of the walk. Mr. Morse said the closest trees over three inches caliper were also outside of the town ROW. He said there are no stumps within two feet of the walkway and the edge of the stump is six feet outside the ROW.

Ms. Harbottle said that First Parish Road has a variable width ROW. Mr. Morse said he found the bound on the opposite side of the street from the plan that the Board endorsed and measured back 42 feet which is the back of the sidewalk. Chairman Pritchard asked if the DPW was comfortable with Mr. Morse's evaluation. Ms. Harbottle said she didn't ask and with a variable width ROW definitive property lines aren't clear. She said it is unusual that the stone wall and tree are not the property boundaries. Mr. Morse indicated the stone wall out there does not appear to be a boundary wall, but a grouping of stones probably placed in the 60's when the greenhouse was in operation. Mr. Taylor clarified that the trees and walls must be in the town ROW for the scenic road act to be in force. Ms. Harbottle said that people were shocked to see the whole site clear cut. Mr. Morse said he was shocked too as he thought they were only going to be demolishing the greenhouses. Chairman Pritchard said that would be a finable violation in the future as no stormwater permit was obtained. Chairman Pritchard asked Mr. Morse to provide an email with the measurements included confirming there was no scenic road violation and Ms. Harbottle would follow up with a letter. Mr. Limbacher moved that based on the evidence presented, there is no violation of the scenic road act. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Pritchard opened the public meeting for a Site Plan Administrative Review for a Common Driveway simultaneously with the Stormwater Public hearing. Mr. Morse indicated the common

driveway will be on lots 3 & 4 and the Stormwater Permit is for lots 2-4. He said the paved common driveway will be 16 feet wide and 88 feet long and is cross sloped east for the stormwater to be picked up in a swale which traverses along the frontage of Lot 4. He indicated there is a 20 feet by 30 foot hammerhead turnaround in front of the garage on Lot 4. Mr. Morse said the stormwater permit for the three lots proposes recharging the difference in what was existing to proposed in drywells on each of the lots. He indicated that the peer review engineer from Amory Engineers said that the rate and volume requirements have been met. Mr. Morse said silt fence has also been added to the plan as requested. He indicated that maintenance will be as outlined in the Operation and Maintenance Plan.

Mr. Limbacher asked about the maintenance on the drywells. Mr. Morse said it is minimal – really just keeping the gutters clean. Ms. Harbottle reported that a positive report was received from Amory Engineers and changes were made. Ms. Burbine expressed shock at the clearcutting. Mr. Limbacher asked how the site drains now. Mr. Morse said the stormwater flows to the rear of the site parallel to First Parish Road toward Kane Drive. Chairman Pritchard thought the view shed for the abutter was being changed. He and Ms. Harbottle expressed concern about the slope adjacent to the neighboring property to the southeast. She asked if there would be a swale at the bottom to direct water away from the neighbor which can be a great concern during construction. Mr. Morse said he can enhance the erosion control at the bottom of the slope, but water goes in that direction now. He said post construction will be grass and also less watershed going to that point. He said he could built a one foot berm on Lot 4. Ms. Harbottle asked about pulling the grades back and doing a wall. Mr. Morse said a wall would be more expensive and he would rather grade the site off. Chairman Pritchard asked about the driveway cross section. Mr. Morse indicated the crushed stone trench had been eliminated in favor of a swale.

The Board discussed having the stormwater permits recorded so that future property owners would be aware of the requirements of the permit and what the limits of disturbance are. Ms. Harbottle said there can be a condition for the common drive that there is a stormwater permit. Mr. Morse said he would look at regrading lot 4 with a wall and screening. He said it will be a front load garage so headlight issues to the abutting property should not be an issue. Ms. Harbottle said any plan changes would need to come back to the Board. Mr. Morse said he will incorporate the requested plan changes. Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicant's request that the Public Meeting for Site Plan Administrative Review for a common driveway on Lots 3 & 4 and Public hearing for the Stormwater Permit for Lots 2-4 182 – 186 First Parish Road be continued until August 25, 2016 at 7:30 pm in the Selectmen's Hearing Room at Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Hwy and continue the time for filing a decision with the Town Clerk until September 9, 2016. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Form A – Country Way

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 32-7-15, 16 & 21

Applicant/Owner: Bradford A. Merritt and Dennis Sullivan, Trustee, Princess Pine Realty Trust

Documents

- Application and Plan of Land Country Way Scituate, MA prepared by Grady Consulting, L.L.C. for Bradford A. Merritt 7/11/16
- Excerpt of Assessor's Map, application, deeds, authorization letter from two owners
- Transmittal to departments dated 7/14 /16

- Recorded Plan of Land Country Way, Scituate, MA by Grady Consulting, L.L.C. dated February 14, 2014
- Email to Board from Laura Harbottle dated 7/26/16 with Form A materials
- Assessor's map by Maps Online People GIS

Kevin Grady and Bradford Merritt were present. Mr. Grady indicated that there is 123 feet of frontage for the lot proposed which is all upland and contains approximately 65,000 sq. ft. He said the lot is accessed from Country Way which is a public way and a scenic road. He indicated the plan conforms to the Board's regulations.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that there are two applicants and they are proposing to combine two smaller lots for frontage and other land to make a buildable lot. She indicated Parcel A has no frontage and is labelled as not a buildable lot so the plan can be endorsed. Mr. Taylor asked why the applicant intended to create a non-buildable parcel. Mr. Grady said there may be future development plans. Chairman Pritchard confirmed there were no stone walls. Mr. Grady said there was a scenic road hearing over a year ago and any changes would be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as Approval Not Required a Plan of Land Country Way, Scituate, MA prepared by Grady Consulting, LLC for applicant Bradford A. Merritt dated 7-11-16 with the notation added to the plan that "Planning Board endorsement of this plan is not a determination as to conformance with the zoning regulations" as the division of land is not a subdivision because Lot 1 as shown on the plan has access and frontage on Country Way – a public way as required by the zoning bylaw. Parcel A is labelled as not a buildable lot as it contains insufficient frontage. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Form A – 704 Country Way
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 20-4-4 & 5
Applicant: Anne Vegnani
Owner: Myron & Louise Buloch c/o Anne Vegnani

Documents

- Application and Plan of Land in Scituate, MA showing a division of parcels 20-4-4 and 20-4-5 704 Country Way, prepared by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. for applicant Myron & Louise A Buloch c/o Anne Vegnani dated 7-21-16
- Transmittal to departments dated 7/25/16
- Email to Board dated 7/26/16 with Form A materials

Greg Morse of Morse Engineering was present to represent the applicant. He indicated that the applicant proposes to divide the land into two lots of greater than 20,000 sq. ft. He said both lots have frontage and lot area. Chairman Pritchard asked for the purpose of the division. Mr. Morse indicated so that Lot 2A could become a buildable lot. Ms. Harbottle asked if there was a plan to address lot width. Mr. Morse said that a common driveway will be proposed.

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as Approval Not Required a Plan of Land in Scituate, MA showing a division of parcels 20-4-4 and 20-4-5 704 Country Way, prepared by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. for applicant Anne Vegnani dated 7-21-16 with the notation added to the plan that "Planning Board endorsement of this plan is not a determination as to conformance with the zoning regulations" as the division of land is not a subdivision because every lot shown on the plan has access and frontage

on Country Way, a public way, as required by the zoning bylaw. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Vote by Planning Board on Wayfinding Signs

Ms. Harbottle showed the graphic to the Board of the proposed Economic Development Commission (EDC) Wayfinding signs. She said that the Design Review Committee (DRC) had some concerns on the sign which included the spacing of the letters, they liked the blue color, they did not care for the dory and they thought the lighthouse was not straight. Ms. Harbottle said the sign has already been trademarked and copyrighted and the spacing of the lettering has been fixed. Ms. Burbine said that she was at the DRC meeting and indicated that the signs had been presented to the Selectmen, EDC and Town Administrator. She said complaints were received at the eleventh hour after over a year of work on the signs. She said from a distance, the straightness of the lighthouse will be unnoticeable. Mr. Taylor confirmed the lettering spacing had been corrected and he said he loved the signs.

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the proposed design of the Wayfinding Signs by Mark Favermann. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Chairman Pritchard asked for further discussion. Ms. Harbottle said the kerning has been corrected and that the only real condition remaining from the DRC may be that the lighthouse be straightened as much as possible. Chairman Pritchard said that the DRC makes recommendations to the Planning Board and if everyone else is happy, he is. Mr. Taylor said the perspective can make the lighthouse look lopsided. Mr. Wynne said this was the type of image that doesn't want to be straight. Ms. Harbottle said that the Planning Board is supposed to weigh in on sign design for public buildings according to the zoning bylaw. Ms. Burbine removed the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Town Planner Report

Ms. Harbottle said there an application for a dog park is expected in the near future which will be located on the hill in front of Go Green. She said it would be some type of site plan approval as there are going to be 20 to 30 parking spaces. She asked the Board if they would want to do a site plan waiver. She indicated an application for a parking lot adjacent to the Roach Field on Beaver Dam Road will also be coming. She said this will also be parking for 20 to 30 cars and be gravel. She said the Board would get site plans for both uses to see how the new use relates to the surrounding area. Ms. Harbottle said both uses will need town meeting approval and proponents are seeking CPC funds. She indicated that the plan contents for a waiver are the same as a full site plan with a survey except there is no legal ad. Mr. Limbacher confirmed that the plans would show the proposed layouts, site entrances, stormwater and parking. Ms. Burbine asked if the Board has received anything on the playground yet. Ms. Harbottle said she has been pushing for a submittal, but has seen nothing yet and the Board may need to send a letter. Chairman Pritchard concurred and said traffic and stormwater should be reviewed and to send a letter.

Accounting

Documents

- PO # 1700880 (\$54.94)

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the requisition of \$54.94 to Welby Builders LLC for a refund for unexpended engineering funds for Lot 8 – 7 Blanchard Farm Lane. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Minutes

Ms. Burbine voted to approve the meeting minutes of 7/14/16. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Liaison Reports

Chairman Pritchard indicated that he and Ms. Harbottle met with Kevin Cafferty and Rick Mosca and got an overview of the town wastewater situation. He said the Town is up against its limits and he will get the Board a memo. He said Mr. Mosca offered to give the Board a tour. Ms. Harbottle said she would make the arrangements.

Old Business and New Business

Documents

- Email to Board dated 7/15/16 from Laura Harbottle with information on Dog Park and Cole Parkway Parking Plan
- Email to Board dated 7/22/16 from Karen Joseph with 7/28/16 agenda
- Email to Board dated 7/25/16 from Karen Joseph with amended 7/28/16 agenda
- Email to the Board dated 7/26/16 from Karen Joseph with meeting minutes from 7/14/16
- Email to the Board dated 7/27/16 from Karen Joseph with second amended agenda for 7/28/16
- Email to the Board dated 7/28/16 from Laura Harbottle with additional meeting materials on the sign logo and Design Review Committee
- Memo from Design Review Committee on signs, microbrewery and 21-23 Ford Place

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Limbacher moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph
Planning Board Secretary

Ann Burbine, Clerk
7-28-16
Date Approved